

Dated: August 31, 1995.

J.C. Card,

*Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard Chief, Office of Marine Safety, Security and Environmental Protection.*

[FR Doc. 95-23516 Filed 9-21-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-P

## **Federal Aviation Administration**

### **Acceptance of Noise Exposure Maps for Riverside Municipal Airport, Riverside, CA**

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) announces its determination that the Noise Exposure Maps submitted by the city of Riverside, California, under the provisions of Title I of the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979 (Pub. L. 96-193) and 14 CFR Part 150 are in compliance with applicable requirements.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** The effective date of the FAA's acceptance of the Noise Exposure Maps for Riverside Municipal Airport, Riverside, California is September 12, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Charles B. Lieber, Airport Planner, Airports Division, AWP-611.1, Federal Aviation Administration, Western-Pacific Region. Mailing address: P.O. Box 92007, Worldway Postal Center, Los Angeles, California 90009-2007. Telephone (310) 725-3614. Street address: 15000 Aviation Boulevard, Hawthorne, California 90261.

Documents reflecting this FAA action may be reviewed at the same location.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This notice announces that the FAA finds that the Noise Exposure Maps submitted for Riverside Municipal Airport, Riverside, California are in compliance with applicable requirements of Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 150, effective September 12, 1995.

Under Section 103 of the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act"), an airport operator may submit to the FAA Noise Exposure Maps which meet applicable regulations and which depict noncompatible land uses as of the date of submission of such maps, a description of projected aircraft operations, and the ways in which such operations will affect such maps. The Act requires such maps to be developed in consultation with interested and affected parties in the local community, government agencies, and persons using the airport.

An airport operator who has submitted Noise Exposure Maps that are found by FAA to be in compliance with the requirements of FAR Part 150, promulgated pursuant to Title I of the Act, may submit a Noise Compatibility Program for FAA approval which sets forth the measures the operator has taken or proposes for the reduction of existing noncompatible uses and for the prevention of the introduction of additional noncompatible uses.

The FAA has completed its review of the Noise Exposure Maps and supporting documentation submitted by the city of Riverside. The specific maps under consideration are Exhibit 2G, "1994 Aircraft Noise Exposure" and Exhibit 2H "1999 Aircraft Noise Exposure" in the submission. The FAA has determined that these maps for Riverside Municipal Airport are in compliance with applicable requirements. This determination is effective on September 12, 1995. FAA's acceptance of an airport operator's Noise Exposure Maps is limited to a finding that the maps were developed in accordance with the procedures contained in Appendix A of FAR Part 150. Such acceptance does not constitute approval of the applicant's data, information or plans, or a commitment to approve a Noise Compatibility Program or to fund the implementation of that program.

If questions arise concerning the precise relationship of specific properties to noise exposure contours depicted on a Noise Exposure Map, submitted under Section 103 of the Act, it should be noted that the FAA is not involved in any way in determining the relative locations of specific properties with regard to the depicted noise contours, or in interpreting the Noise Exposure Maps to resolve questions concerning, for example, which properties should be covered by the provisions of Section 107 of the Act. These functions are inseparable from the ultimate land use control and planning responsibilities of local government. These local responsibilities are not changed in any way under FAR Part 150 or through FAA's review of the Noise Exposure Maps. Therefore, the responsibility for the detailed overlaying of noise exposure contours onto the map depicting properties on the surface rests exclusively with the airport operator which submitted those maps, or with those public agencies and planning agencies with which consultation is required under Section 103 of the Act. The FAA has relied on the certification by the airport operator, under Section 150.21 of FAR Part 150,

that the statutory required consultation has been accomplished.

Copies of the Noise Exposure Maps and of the FAA's evaluation of the maps are available for examination at the following locations:

Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Room 617, Washington, D.C. 20591

Federal Aviation Administration, Western-Pacific Region, Airports Division, Room 3012, 15000 Aviation Boulevard, Hawthorne, California 90261

Mr. John Sabatello, Airport Director, Riverside Municipal Airport, 6951 Flight Road, Riverside, California 92504.

Questions may be directed to the individual named above under the heading **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Issued in Hawthorne, California on September 12, 1995.

Robert C. Bloom,

*Acting Manager, Airports Division, AWP-600 Western-Pacific Region.*

[FR Doc. 95-23565 Filed 9-21-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

### **RTCA, Inc. Special Committee 185; Aeronautical Spectrum Planning Issues**

Pursuant to section 10(a) (2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, 5 U.S.C., Appendix 2), notice is hereby given for Special Committee 185 meeting to be held October 10-11, 1995, starting at 9:00 a.m. The meeting will be held at the RTCA, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Suite 1020, Washington, DC 20036.

The agenda will be as follows: (1) Welcome and Administrative Remarks; (2) Introductions; (3) Review and Approval of the Agenda; (4) Review and Approval of the Summary of the Previous Meeting; (5) Review of Results of Working Group 1 Editorial Group Meeting; (6) Presentations; (7) Assignment of Tasks; (8) Other Business; (7) Date and Place of Next Meeting.

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to space availability. With the approval of the chairman, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to present statements or obtain information should contact the RTCA Secretariat, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Suite 1020, Washington, DC 20036; (202) 833-9339 (phone) or (202) 833-9434 (fax). Members of the public may present a written statement to the committee at any time.

Issued in Washington, DC, on September 18, 1995.

Janice L. Peters,  
*Designated Official.*

[FR Doc. 95-23564 Filed 9-21-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-13-M

## UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION

### Sentencing Guidelines for United States Courts

**AGENCY:** United States Sentencing Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of priority areas for Commission research and amendment study. Request for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** As part of its statutory continuing responsibility to analyze sentencing issues, including the operation of the federal sentencing guidelines, the Commission has identified certain priorities as the principal focus of its work in the coming year and, in some cases, beyond. Following the practice of past years, the Commission invites comment on identified priorities (including the scope and manner of study, particular problem areas and possible solutions, and any other matters relevant to an identified priority). The Commission also invites comment on any other aspect of guideline application that it should address during the coming year.

**DATES:** Public comment should be received not later than October 31, 1995, to be considered by the Commission in shaping its work during the next year.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments to: United States Sentencing Commission, One Columbus Circle, N.E., Suite 2-500 South, Washington, D.C. 20002-8002, Attention: Public Information—Priorities Comment.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michael Courlander, Public Information Specialist, Telephone: (202) 273-4590.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The United States Sentencing Commission, an independent agency in the judicial branch of the United States Government, is empowered by 28 U.S.C. § 994(a) to promulgate sentencing guidelines and policy statements for federal sentencing courts. The statute further directs the Commission to periodically review and revise guidelines previously promulgated and authorizes it to submit guideline amendments to the Congress no later than the first day of May each year. See 28 U.S.C. § 994(o), (p).

As in previous years, the Commission uses this announcement to solicit formal

and informal comment regarding certain areas upon which the Commission expects to concentrate its attention during the coming year. This notice provides interested persons with an opportunity to inform the Commission of legal, operational, or policy concerns within the identified areas relating to the guidelines and to suggest specific solutions and alternative approaches.

Following are the priority areas for amendment study, research, or other planned actions identified by the Commission. Where possible, a general timeframe for the initiative is indicated. These timeframes should be considered subject to change as the Commission deems necessary.

- **Measuring the Success of the Guidelines:** A staff working group, under the direction of an outside consultant, has undertaken a number of projects that will measure the success of the guidelines in meeting the goals set forth in the Sentencing Reform Act. Projects related to just punishment, recidivism, and selective incapacitation are well underway. Other projects will examine offense seriousness, real-offense sentencing, judicial discretion, criminal history, alternatives to incarceration, and disparity.

- **Guideline Simplification and Modification:** A staff working group, under the direction of an outside consultant, will focus on simplifying and improving the guidelines. This effort will be informed substantially by the work, discussed above, measuring the success of the guidelines. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 994 (o), (p), and (x), the Commission intends that this process will involve consultation with a wide variety of interested groups and individuals. The Commission has prepared the following purpose statement for this working group:

Working Group on Guideline Simplification: Purpose Statement

#### I. Introduction

The Sentencing Commission, at its May meeting, identified comprehensive review of the federal guidelines system as a top agency priority. The Commission is well positioned to undertake this task, given the vast amounts of information available from the more than 225,000 cases sentenced under the guidelines during the past eight years, numerous appellate opinions issued on various guidelines issues, the growing body of academic literature and public comment, and the extensive empirical analysis of the guidelines conducted to date.

This purpose statement outlines the working group's proposed scope of inquiry and methodology.

#### II. Working Group Mandate

The objective of the working group's comprehensive review of the guidelines is twofold: 1) to reduce the complexity of guideline application ("simplification"); and 2) to improve federal sentencing by working closely with the judiciary and others to refine the guidelines (revisiting the balance of judicial flexibility/discretion and the availability of alternative punishments). The group will comprehensively and aggressively assess each major section of the guidelines, critique application complexities, and develop options for Commission consideration. Complexity is viewed as the source of confusion and frustration in guideline application. Moreover, this confusion results in unreliable application and judicial resistance—two outcomes that undermine the effectiveness of the guidelines.

Guideline complexity derives, in part, from fundamental decisions made by the original Commission in its effort to meet the Sentencing Reform Act's twin goals of: 1) assuring that the purposes of sentencing are met (i.e., just punishment, deterrence, incapacitation, and rehabilitation); and 2) providing certainty and fairness in meeting the purposes of sentencing while avoiding unwarranted disparities between similarly situated defendants (see 28 U.S.C. § 991(b)(1)). To ensure that the ramifications of all options for change are clear, the group will highlight the broader policy implications of its proposals (e.g., its effect on proportionality or a judge's ability to individualize sentences).

#### III. Methodology

The working group proposes the following strategy to assist commissioners in their deliberations on how they might simplify and improve the guidelines system. The group will prepare *concise* issue papers on major guideline topics to provide a foundation for Commission consideration of relevant issues and possible sentencing models. Each paper will:

- Review the history behind the original policy decision so as to ensure that the Commission is sensitive to the underlying principles and the impact of any revisions on these principles;
- Assess how the particular guideline is working (e.g., application complexities; frequency of use identified through monitoring data);
- Summarize information needs that might reasonably assist the